



7700  
AF

PTO/SB/21 (09-06)

Approved for use through 03/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>TRANSMITTAL FORM</b>  (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10/070,411	
	Filing Date	October 9, 2002	
	First Named Inventor	Janne J. KALLIO	
	Art Unit	2617	
	Examiner Name	Marcos TORRES	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	6	Attorney Docket Number	915-003.006

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<b>Remarks</b>  The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees or deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 23-0442.	
<b>SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT</b>		
Firm Name	Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson, LLP	
Signature	<i>Keith R. Oert</i>	
Printed name	Keith R. Oert	
Date	November 7, 2006	Reg. No. 58,051

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:	
Signature	<i>Kathleen Sipos</i>
Typed or printed name	Kathleen Sipos
Date	November 7, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



Attorney Docket No. 915-003.006  
Serial No.10/070,411

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In Re Application of:

**Janne J. KALLIO**

Serial No: **10/070,411** : Examiner: **Marcos TORRES**

Filed: **October 9, 2002** : Group Art Unit: **2617**

For: **NETWORK FREQUENCY SETTING**

**MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**REPLY BRIEF (37 C.F.R. § 41.41)**


Sir:

This is a reply brief in regard to a final Office Action (mailed November 17, 2005) and an Advisory Action (mailed February 16, 2006), and in furtherance of an Appeal Brief (mailed June 13, 2006), and in reply to an Examiner's Answer (mailed September 8, 2006).

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Mail Stop Appeal Brief, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

  
Kathleen Sipos

Dated: Nov. 7, 2006

**REMARKS**

This Reply Brief is in response to the Examiner's Answer of September 8, 2006. In the Examiner's Answer the Office continues to reject claims 1-5, 7-8, 10, 14-17 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Soliman in view of Bauchot, claims 6 and 9 as unpatentable over Soliman in view of Bauchot and further in view of Gass, claim 13 as unpatentable over Soliman in view of Bauchot and further in view of Toda, claims 18 and 26 as unpatentable over Soliman in view of Bauchot and further in view of Matsuno, claims 19-20 as unpatentable over Soliman in view of Bauchot and further in view of Lu, and claim 21 as unpatentable over Soliman in view of Bauchot and Lu, and further in view of Matsuno.

Appellant continues to assert the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief, and responds to the Examiner's Answer with the discussion presented below.

**Response to Argument (10)**

**No Motivation to Combine the Cited References**

Appellant respectfully submits that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Soliman with those of Bauchot. The Office asserts that Bauchot is directed to synchronizing timing between different communication networks. However, Bauchot does not relate to synchronization of different networks, but instead only provides a traffic scheduling method for control of communication between networks. See Bauchot column 1, lines 9-14. The scheduling method discussed in Bauchot uses the arrival time of data cells to determine a deadline of each cell before that cell has to be transmitted in order to meet quality of service requirements. See Bauchot column 2, lines 55-60. Therefore, Bauchot is not concerned with accurately setting frequencies between base stations of different networks. In contrast, claim 1 of the present application recites adjusting a second frequency of a second communication network with the aim of establishing a desired relationship between the second frequency and a first frequency of a first communication network. Therefore, there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of Bauchot with those of Soliman, because Bauchot merely provides a scheduler for controlling cell traffic from separate communication networks.

Contrary to the assertions presented on page 10 of the Examiner's Answer, the idea of providing the delay in Bauchot is not to synchronize the first network, i.e. a synchronous network, with the second network, i.e. an asynchronous network. Time slots are allocated to data cells that are to be exchanged between synchronous and asynchronous terminals based on the time after which the required quality of service of the connection is not met. See Bauchot column 3, lines 11-16. Therefore, the transfer of data cells between the asynchronous and synchronous networks in Bauchot is not based on matching time slots between different networks, i.e. synchronization, but instead scheduling based on the quality of service for each connection. See e.g. Bauchot column 5, lines 56-58 (the scheduler gives a priority to each connection based on its service class). As such, the transmission between different networks in Bauchot has nothing to do with modifying the frequency of one network to correspond with the frequency of another network, as recited in claim 1. At most, the combination of Soliman and Bauchot would only provide a person skilled in the art with a method of setting the frequency of one base station according another base station in the same network, and a method of scheduling traffic between an asynchronous network and a synchronous network to meet quality of service requirements, in which the scheduling does not involve synchronizing the frequency of transmission of each network. There is no suggestion or motivation to combine Soliman and Bauchot to arrive at setting the frequency of a base station in a second network based on the frequency used by a base station in a first network, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, the Office asserts that it has not engaged in impermissible hindsight reasoning by simply using appellant's disclosure to piece together teachings from the prior art references. The Office states that Soliman provides an example of improving handoff reliability, and asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would look to Bauchot in order to accomplish a handoff between networks. However, appellant respectfully submits that one of skill in the art would not look to the teachings of Bauchot for accomplishing a handoff between networks. Bauchot makes no mention or suggestion of performing handoffs, and instead only addresses establishing communication between a terminal in an asynchronous network with a terminal in a synchronous network. Bauchot does not disclose or suggest a terminal traveling between different networks, and thus requiring a handoff to take place in order for the terminal to continue communicating. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art

would have no motivation or suggestion to implement the limitations recited in claim 1, in which the frequency used by a first base station in one network is used to adjust the frequency of a second base station in another network. Soliman only discloses that the frequencies used by base stations within a network are set by cascading time and frequency values through the base stations of that same network. In contrast, the limitations recited in claim 1 address, for example, the problem of synchronizing clocks across a transmission in which part of the transmission chain to a base station runs across an unlocked network. Neither Soliman nor Bauchot address or even consider this problem, and therefore there is no motivation or suggestion to combine their teachings so that the frequency used by a base station in one network is adjusted in accordance with a frequency used in a second network, as recited in claim 1. Instead, the Office has merely engaged in hindsight reasoning by citing Bauchot, in which two networks are in communication, and Soliman, in which a single network's time and frequency are synchronized, and asserting that it would be obvious to apply the teachings of Soliman across two different networks.


Finally, in response to the Office's assertion that the appellant has attacked references individually. Appellant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons discussed above there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of the cited references. In order to establish obviousness, there must be some motivation or suggestion to combine the cited references, and the cited references when combined must teach all of the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2142. Since there is no motivation to combine the cited references, the cited references cannot disclose all of the limitations recited in the claims. Therefore, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1.

The discussion above in relation to claim 1 is equally applicable to the other independent claims in the application. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, the other independent claims are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. The dependent claims in the application are further not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above as well as those previously presented in appellant's Appeal Brief of June 13, 2006, appellant respectfully submits that the rejections of the final Office Action have been shown to be inapplicable, and respectfully requests that the Board reverses the rejections to pending claims 1-10 and 13-30. The undersigned believes that no additional fee is required to submit this Reply Brief, but hereby authorizes the Commission to charge deposit account 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this Reply Brief.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith R. Obert  
Attorney for the Appellant  
Registration No. 58,051

Date: 7 November 2006

KRO/kas  
Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
(203) 261-1234  
FAX: (203) 261-5676  
Customer No. 004955